



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,277	02/22/2005	Gavin Paul Vinson	133088.00301(P33791US)	6075
35151	7590	12/04/2008	EXAMINER	
Pepper Hamilton LLP 400 Berwyn Park 899 Cassatt Road Berwyn, PA 19312-1183			YAEN, CHRISTOPHER H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1643	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/525,277	Applicant(s) VINSON ET AL.	
	Examiner CHRISTOPHER H. YAEN	Art Unit 1643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/2/05, 10/13/08</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.
2. Claims 12-28 are pending and examined on the merits.
3. The Information Disclosure Statements filed on 8/2/2005 and 10/13/08 are acknowledged and considered. Signed copies of the IDS are attached hereto.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 1st paragraph

4. Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claims of the instant invention are drawn to a vaccine composition comprising a peptide sequence comprising the N-Terminal portion of Angiotensin type-1 receptor of SEQ ID No: 1 The specification provides no guidance on the administration of the claimed vaccine composition or any portion thereof as a vaccine for treatment of disease.

The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized In re Wands 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988). The court in Wands states: "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue,' not

Art Unit: 1643

'experimentation.' " (Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations." (Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1404). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount or direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

The goal of tumor vaccination is the induction of tumor immunity to prevent tumor recurrence and to eliminate residual disease. However, Ezzell (J. NIH Res, 1995, 7:46-49) reviews the current thinking in cancer vaccines and states that tumor immunologists are reluctant to place bets on which cancer vaccine approach will prove effective in the long run (see the entire document, particularly last paragraph) and further states that no one is very optimistic that a single peptide will trigger an immune response strong enough to eradicate tumors or even to prevent the later growth of micrometastases among patients whose tumors have been surgically removed or killed by radiation or chemotherapy (p 48, paragraph 6). In addition, Spitler (Cancer Biotherapy, 1995, 10:1-3) recognizes the lack of predictability of the nature of the art when she states that "Ask practicing oncologists what they think about cancer vaccines and you're likely to get the following response: "cancer vaccines don't work". Ask a venture capitalist or the director

Art Unit: 1643

of product development at a large pharmaceutical company and you're likely to get the same response." (p 1, paragraph 1). Further, Boon (Adv Can Res, 1992, 58:177-210) teaches that for active immunization in human patients we have to stimulate immune defenses of organisms that have often carried a large tumor burden. Establishment of immune tolerance may therefore have occurred and it may prevent immunization and several lines of evidence suggest that large tumor burdens can tolerize or at least depress the capability to respond against the tumor (p. 206, paragraph 2).

DeGruilj et al (Nature Medicine, 5410): 1124-1125, Oct. 1999) state that a variety of anti-tumor vaccine trials have been undertaken and in spite of the large number of these trials, and the plethora of distinct approaches investigated, there has been little evidence of clinical efficacy. In fact, vaccine compositions would encompass all of the problems associated with treating cancer, as well as additional obstacles such as preventing the events that lead to transformation of a normal cell into a cancer cell including preventing genetic mutation, and immortalization. Amending the claims to recite "A composition" or "A therapeutic composition" or similar language would obviate this part of the instant rejection under 112, first paragraph.

In view of the teachings above, and the lack of guidance and or exemplification in the specification, at the time the application was filed it would not have been predictable for of skill in the art to use the vaccine formulations as contemplated in the disclosure. Thus, it would require undue experimentation by one of skill in the art to practice the invention as claimed

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Claims 12-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a composition comprising a sequence of SEQ ID No: 1 or a method of treating cancer or disease comprising the administration of an antibody directed against SEQ ID No: 1 or 2 only, does not reasonably provide enablement for a vaccine composition comprising fragments of SEQ ID No: 1 or methods of treating cancer or disease comprising the administration of an antibody directed against conservative mutants of, active fragments of SEQ ID No: 1 or 2, as claimed. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Protein chemistry is probably one of the most unpredictable areas of biotechnology. It is known in the art that the relationship between the amino acid sequence of a protein (polypeptide) and its tertiary structure (i.e. its binding activity) are not well understood and are not predictable (see Ngo et al., in *The Protein Folding Problem and Tertiary Structure Prediction*, 1994, Merz, et al., (ed.), Birkhauser, Boston, MA, pp. 433 and 492-495). There is no recognition in the art that sequence with identity predicts biological function. It is known in the art that even single amino acid changes or differences in a protein's amino acid sequence can have dramatic effects on the protein's function. For example, conservative replacement of a single "lysine" residue at position 118 of acidic fibroblast growth factor by "glutamic acid" led to the substantial loss of heparin binding, receptor binding and biological activity of the protein (Burgess et

Art Unit: 1643

al., J of Cell Bio. 111:2129-2138, 1990). In transforming growth factor alpha, replacement of aspartic acid at position 47 with alanine or asparagine did not affect biological activity while replacement with serine or glutamic acid sharply reduced the biological activity of the mitogen (Lazar et al. Molecular and Cellular Biology 8:1247-1252, 1988). These references demonstrate that even a single amino acid substitution or what appears to be an inconsequential chemical modification will often dramatically affect the biological activity and characteristic of a protein.

Furthermore, the specification fails to teach what deletions, truncations, substitutions and mutations of the disclosed sequence can be tolerated that will allow the protein to function as claimed, and further to allow a monoclonal antibody to bind with the retained specificity. It is also well known in the art that for a monoclonal antibody to bind to a protein sequence, the protein sequence must maintain a strict sequence and or binding structure. For example, Coleman et al. (Research in Immunology, 1994; 145(1): 33-36) teach single amino acid changes in an antigen can effectively abolish antibody antigen binding. Furthermore, Abaza et al. (Journal of Protein Chemistry, Vol. 11, No. 5, 1992, pages 433-444, see abstract in particular) teach single amino acid substitutions outside the antigenic site on a protein affects antibody binding. These references demonstrate that even a single amino acid alteration or what appears to be an inconsequential chemical modification will often dramatically affect the biological activity and characteristics of a binding protein or antibody.

Art Unit: 1643

The specification as filed has failed to provide those of skill in the art with any guidance as to which amino acids can be altered and yet maintain monoclonal antibody binding specificity. Therefore in the absence of this evidence those of skill in the art would be forced into undue experimentation to practice the invention within the full scope of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujisawa *et al* (CA2093495-A). Fujisawa *et al* teach a sequence comprising the sequence of SEQ ID No: 1 as claimed.

8. Claims 14,16,19-21,23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vinson *et al* (WO 95/09186 IDS 8/2/2005) Vinson *et al* teach a method of using an antibody for the treatment of diseases, such as breast cancer comprising the administration of an antibody that is specific for angiotensin II type -1 receptor, wherein the antibody is the one designated by the accession number 93072117.

Art Unit: 1643

Conclusion

No claims is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER H. YAEN whose telephone number is (571)272-0838. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms, Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher H Yaen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1643